

# County of Hamilton

WILLIAM W. BRAYSHAW, P.E.-P.S. COUNTY ENGINEER

700 COUNTY ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

138 EAST COURT STREET

CINCINNATI, OHIO 45202-1258

PHONE (513) 632-8523

FAX (513) 723-9748

60th District #2 Integrating Committee Meeting Minutes  
Board of County Commissioners' Conference Room  
Room 603, County Administration Building  
Cincinnati, OH 45202

April 18, 1996 - 8:00 a.m.

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Brayshaw at 8:10 a.m. Mr. Hamner was the only Committee Member not present.

Support Staff present: Messrs. Cottrill, Cline, Beck, Pettit, Schlimm, Bass and Vogel. Also present was Prem Garg from the City of Cincinnati.

Mr. Seitz moved approval of the February 2, 1996 minutes; seconded by Mr. Mendes and passed unanimously.

Mr. Cottrill explained the District 2 Integrating Committee listing of members stressing that all terms expire on May 31, 1997 and the respective members should see to it that their appointing authorities are advised so the member can be reappointed for an additional three year term before their term expires.

A request was received from Colerain Township to amend two of its project agreements (CBG09 and CBG04), transferring funds from one LTIP project to another within the same general area. This procedure, which we have utilized previously, will result in no net change of funds being dispersed to Colerain Township. Mr. Sykes moved that the project amendment for Colerain Township be approved; seconded by Mayor Brooks and approved unanimously.

Mr. Cottrill stated that Anthony Wayne Avenue rehabilitation, a joint project between Lockland and Lincoln Heights, had been funded for a grant of \$481,750. The County will provide local match for this project from the Municipal Road Fund.

Mr. Cottrill requested comments on the Draft Round 11 Rating System that had been mailed to the Committee Members previously.

Under Criterion 1 - Ability to Proceed on the Addendum to the Rating System, it was decided to change the last sentence to read "A jurisdiction receiving approval for a project and subsequently cancelling the same after the bid date on the application, may be considered as having a delinquent project". Designation, of course, would be at the discretion of the Integrating Committee.

On the rating sheet under 3) regarding facility's serviceability, it was suggested to change the 2 point category to read "Project design is for minimal increase in capacity", not "demand", as was originally worded.

Under Criterion 4 - Health, Safety & Welfare on the Addendum, the Committee requested examples be included in each category which will give the jurisdictions some guidelines.

60th District #2 Integrating Committee Meeting Minutes

April 18, 1996

Another suggestion by Committee Members under 5) Economic Health was to reduce the number of points from 10 to 5. It would be 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, rather than 2, 4, 6, 8, 10.

Under 10) it was suggested by some Committee Members to increase the importance of the jurisdiction enactment of the \$5 license plate fee or some sort of dedicated levy for infrastructure purposes, from a 2 point item to a 5 point item. They would like to see it be 5, 3, 0 in lieu of 2, 1, 0.

The Support Staff was requested to take these suggestions and see how they can be implemented into the rating system criteria.

Chairman Brayshaw concurred with Mr. Seitz that the recommendations were worthy of further consideration.

With Mr. Huddleston having to leave, the Committee agreed to hold this question until the Support Staff could analyze the changes. It was unanimously agreed to meet on May 24, 1996 at 8:00 a.m. to finalize the rating system in order to get it to OPWC before the June 28, 1996 deadline.

Small Governments - Mr. Sykes gave a synopsis of our projects that were submitted and indicated that it will all be contingent on some other large projects that have been submitted for Small Government funding, but it looks like District 2 may have as many as five Small Government projects. Voting on projects will be May 14 so by our next meeting we will know which projects have been approved.


Old Business - None

New Business - Mr. Cottrill reported there will be a press conference held on Friday, June 28, 1996 - 10:30 a.m. at which time Mr. Bicking will distribute the Round 10 project agreements to the respective jurisdictions.

Mr. Brayshaw announced that the County Engineer's Office was having a seminar for maintenance, design and construction type people at the Springfield Township Grove on Winton Road and invited all to attend.

Mr. Seitz moved adjournment; seconded by Mr. Heile and approved unanimously. Meeting adjourned 9:15 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Joan Cornelius  
Recording Secretary

cc: Support Staff



## COLERAIN TOWNSHIP PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT ROAD DIVISION

**ROAD SUPERINTENDENT**

DENNIS B. CHAPMAN

**ADMINISTRATOR**

DAVID L. FOGLESONG

4725 SPRINGDALE ROAD, CINCINNATI, OHIO 45251

513-385-7502

FAX 513-385-4458

**BOARD OF TRUSTEES**

PATRICIA M. CLANCY

KEITH MILLER

JOSEPH R. WOLTERMAN

**CLERK**

KATHY J. MOHR

March 27, 1996

Mr. William Brayshaw, County Engineer  
District II Integrating Committee  
138 East Court Street  
700 County Administration Bldg.  
Cincinnati, Ohio 45202

RE: Project Amendment Between LTIP Projects

Dear Mr. Brayshaw,

Colerain Township is requesting the Integrating Committee to review and approve the transfer of funds between two of our LTIP funded projects. Below is information and the need for Colerain Township to request the transfer.

Roundtop Road Reconstruction - CBG03, Rinda Lane Reconstruction - CBG09 and Orchardhill Subdivision Rehabilitation - CBG04 were three projects that received LTIP funding for Round 9. Colerain Township bid these as three separate projects under one contract. These three projects have met bid dates and are on schedule for construction. The overall bid for the total construction cost came in under the estimated amount per our LTIP applications. The three projects lumped together are under the grant amounts by \$123,259.55. The Roundtop Road Reconstruction Project - CBG03 is under the grant amount by \$56,264.00. The Rinda Lane Reconstruction Project - CBG09 is under the grant amount by \$111,163.29. The Orchardhill Subdivision Rehabilitation Project - CBG04 is over the grant amount by \$44,167.33. In addition to this amount, Colerain Township has reinspected the conditions of the Orchardhill Subdivision streets and re-evaluated their estimates after being through the severe winter. Upon our reinspection, we have a significant amount of increased deterioration. The curbs and the partial depth repaired areas suffered the most added deterioration. There are now areas in need of full depth replacement. This added deterioration has increased our estimates by \$21,133.00.

Due to this situation, Colerain Township requests the Integrating Committee to approve a project amendment for the Rinda Lane Reconstruction Project - CBG09 and for the Orchardhill Subdivision Rehabilitation Project - CBG04. The total amount needed for transfer will be \$63,187.00. This will reduce the Rinda Lane Reconstruction Project - CBG09 to a total grant of \$206,813.00, and increase the Orchardhill Subdivision Rehabilitation Project - CBG04 to a total grant of \$212,416.00.

Thank you in advance for your support in this request of project amendment. If you need any additional information please do not hesitate to call at 385-7502.

Sincerely,

  
Dennis B. Chapman  
Road Superintendent

OFFICE OF THE  
COUNTY ENGINEER  
MAY 1 1996  
11:47

**SCIP/LTIP PROGRAM**  
**ROUND 11 - PROGRAM YEAR 1997**  
**PROJECT SELECTION CRITERIA**  
**JULY 1, 1997 TO JUNE 30, 1998**

**ADOPTED BY THE INTEGRATING COMMITTEE**

JURISDICTION/AGENCY: \_\_\_\_\_

NAME OF PROJECT: \_\_\_\_\_

TOTAL POINTS FOR THIS PROJECT: \_\_\_\_\_ RATING TEAM: \_\_\_\_\_

- |    |   |               |
|----|---|---------------|
|    |   | <u>POINTS</u> |
| 1) | If SCIP/LTIP funds are granted, when would the construction contract be awarded?  |               |
|    | 10 Points - Will be under contract by end of 1997 and no delinquent projects in Rounds 8 & 9.   | _____         |
|    | 5 Points - Will be under contract by March 30, 1998 and/or jurisdiction has had one delinquent project in Rounds 8 & 9.               |               |
|    | 0 Points - Will not be under contract by March 30, 1998 and/or jurisdiction has had more than one delinquent project in Rounds 8 & 9. |               |
| 2) | What is the physical condition of the existing infrastructure to be replaced or repaired?   |               |
|    | 20 Points - Failed  |               |
|    | 18 Points - Critical  | _____         |
|    | 16 Points - Very Poor   |               |
|    | 14 Points - Poor  |               |
|    | 12 Points - Moderately Poor   |               |
|    | 8 Points - Moderately Fair  |               |
|    | 4 Points - Fair Condition   |               |
|    | 0 Points - Good or Better   |               |

NOTE: If the infrastructure is in "good" or better condition, it will NOT be considered for SCIP/LTIP funding unless it is an expansion project that will improve serviceability.

21 If the project is built, what will be its effect on the facility's serviceability? Documentation is required.

- 5 Points - Project design is for future demand. \_\_\_\_\_
- 4 Points - Project design is for partial future demand.
- 3 Points - Project design is for current demand.
- 2 Points - Project design is for minimal increase in demand.
- 1 Point - Project design is for no increase in capacity.

4) How important is the project to HEALTH, SAFETY, AND WELFARE of the public and the citizens of the District and/or service area?

- 10 Points - Highly significant importance, with substantial impact on all 3 factors. \_\_\_\_\_
- 8 Points - Considerably significant importance, with substantial impact on 2 factors, or noticeable impact on all 3 factors.
- 6 Points - Moderate importance, with substantial impact on 1 factor or noticeable impact on 2 factors.
- 4 Points - Minimal importance, with noticeable impact on 1 factor
- 2 Points - No measurable impact

5) What is the overall economic health of the jurisdiction?

- 10 Points \_\_\_\_\_
- 8 Points
- 6 Points
- 4 Points
- 2 Points

6) What matching funds are being committed to the project, expressed as as a percentage of the TOTAL CONSTRUCTION COST? Loan and Credit Enhancement projects automatically receive 5 points, and no match is required. All grant funded projects require a minimum of 10% matching funds.

- 5 Points - 50% or more \_\_\_\_\_
- 4 Points - 40% to 49.99%
- 3 Points - 30% to 39.99%
- 2 Points - 20% to 29.99%
- 1 Point - 10% to 19.99%

7) Has any formal action by a federal, state, or local government agency resulted in a partial or complete ban of the usage or expansion of the usage for the involved infrastructure? POINTS MAY ONLY BE AWARDED IF THE END RESULT OF THE PROJECT WILL CAUSE THE BAN TO BE LIFTED.

- 5 Points - Complete ban
  - 3 Points - Partial ban
  - 0 Points - No ban of any kind
- 

8) What is the total number of existing daily users that will benefit as a result of the proposed project? Appropriate criteria include current traffic counts, households served, when converted to a measurement of persons. Public transit users are permitted to be counted for the roads and bridges, but only when certifiable ridership figures are provided.

- 5 Points - 16,000 or more
  - 4 Points - 12,000 to 15,999
  - 3 Points - 8,000 to 11,999
  - 2 Points - 4,000 to 7,999
  - 1 Point - 3,999 and under
- 

9) Does the infrastructure have regional impact? Consider originations and destinations of traffic, functional classifications, size of service area, number of jurisdictions served, etc.

- 5 Points - Major impact
  - 4 Points -
  - 3 Points - Moderate impact
  - 2 Points -
  - 1 Point - Minimal or no impact
- 

10) Has the jurisdiction enacted the optional \$5 license plate fee, an infrastructure levy, a user fee, or a dedicated tax for infrastructure and provided certification of which fees have been enacted?

- 2 Points - Two of the above
  - 1 Point - One of the above
  - 0 Points - None of the above
-

**ADDENDUM TO THE RATING SYSTEM  
DEFINITIONS/CLARIFICATIONS**

**Criterion 1 - ABILITY TO PROCEED**

The Support Staff will assign points based on engineering experience and OPWC defined delinquent projects. A project is considered delinquent when it has not received a notice to proceed within the time stated on the original application and no time extension has been granted by the OPWC. A jurisdiction receiving approval for a project and subsequently cancels the same may be considered as having a delinquent project.

**Criterion 2 - CONDITION**

Condition is based on the amount of deterioration that is field verified or documented exclusive of capacity, serviceability, or health, safety and welfare issues. Condition is rated only on the existing facility being repaired or abandoned. If the existing facility is not being abandoned or repaired, but a new facility is being built, it shall be considered as an expansion project. (Documentation may include ODOT BR-86 reports, pavement management condition reports, televised underground system reports, age inventory reports, maintenance records, etc., and will only be considered if included with the original application.)

**DEFINITIONS:**

**FAILED CONDITION** - Requires complete reconstruction where no part of the existing facility is salvageable. (e.g. Roads: complete reconstruction of roadway, curbs and base; Bridges: complete removal and replacement of bridge; Underground: removal and replacement of an underground drainage or water system; Hydrants: completely non-functioning and replacement parts are unavailable.)

**CRITICAL CONDITION** - Requires moderate or partial reconstruction to maintain integrity. (e.g. Roads: reconstruction of roadway, curbs can be saved; Bridges: removal and replacement of bridge with abutment modification; Underground: removal and replacement of part of an underground drainage or water system; Hydrants: some non-functioning, others obsolete and replacement parts are unavailable.)

**VERY POOR CONDITION** - Requires extensive rehabilitation to maintain integrity. (e.g. Roads: extensive full depth, partial depth and curb repair of a roadway with a structural overlay; Bridges: superstructure replacement; Underground: repair of joints and/or minor replacement of pipe sections; Hydrants: non-functioning and replacement parts are available.)

**POOR CONDITION** - Requires standard rehabilitation to maintain integrity. (e.g. Roads: moderate full depth, partial depth and curb repair to a roadway with no structural overlay needed or structural overlay with minor repairs to a roadway needed; Bridges: extensive patching of substructure and replacement of deck; Underground: insituform or other in ground repairs; Hydrants: functional, but leaking and replacement parts are unavailable.)

**MODERATELY POOR CONDITION** - Requires minor rehabilitation to maintain integrity. (e.g. Roads: minor full depth, partial depth or curb repairs to a roadway with either a thin overlay or no overlay needed; Bridges: major structural patching and/or major deck repair; Hydrants: functional and replacement parts are available.)

MODERATELY FAIR CONDITION - Requires extensive maintenance to maintain integrity. (e.g. Roads: thin or no overlay with extensive crack sealing, minor partial depth and/or slurry or rejuvenation; Bridges: minor structural patching, crack repair, erosion control.)

FAIR CONDITION - Requires routine maintenance to maintain integrity. (e.g. Roads: slurry seal, rejuvenation or routine crack sealing to the roadway; Bridges: minor structural patching.)

GOOD OR BETTER CONDITION - Little or no maintenance required to maintain integrity.

#### Criterion 4 - HEALTH, SAFETY & WELFARE

##### Definitions:

SAFETY - The design of the project will prevent accidents, promote safer conditions, and eliminate or reduce the danger of risk, liability, or injury.

HEALTH - The design of the project will improve the overall condition of the facility so as to reduce or eliminate disease; or correct concerns regarding the environmental health of the area.

WELFARE - The design of the project will promote economic well-being and prosperity.

#### Criterion 9 - REGIONAL IMPACT

##### Definitions:

MAJOR IMPACT - Roads: major multi-jurisdictional route, primary feed to an interstate, Federal Aid Primary routes; Underground: primary water or sewer main serving entire system; Hydrants: multi-jurisdictional.

MODERATE IMPACT - Roads: principal thoroughfares, Federal Aid Urban routes; Underground: primary water or sewer main serving only part of a system; Hydrants: all hydrants in a local system serving only one jurisdiction.

MINIMAL/NO IMPACT - Roads: cul-de-sacs, subdivision streets; Underground: individual water or sewer main not part of a large system; Hydrants: only some hydrants in a local system serving only one jurisdiction.



## TAFT, STETTINIUS &amp; HOLLISTER

1800 STAR BANK CENTER

425 WALNUT STREET

CINCINNATI, OHIO 45202-3957

513-381-2838

FAX: 513-381-0205

COLUMBUS, OHIO OFFICE  
TWELFTH FLOOR  
21 EAST STATE STREET  
COLUMBUS, OHIO 43215-4221  
614-221-2838  
FAX: 614-221-2007

NORTHERN KENTUCKY OFFICE  
THOMAS MORE CENTRE  
3870 CHANCELLOR DRIVE  
CHERRYVIEW HILLS, KENTUCKY 41017-2491  
606-331-2838  
513-381-2838  
FAX: 513-381-8813

CLEVELAND, OHIO OFFICE  
SUITE 200 - 6140 WEST CREEK ROAD  
CLEVELAND, OHIO 44131-2130  
216-642-0707  
FAX: 216-642-0708

*mailed to Integrating  
Committee members from  
H&R's office 4-19-96*

FAX Transmission

Date: April 18, 1996

To: Joe Cottrell, County Engineer's Office

From: Bill Seltz

Comments: Please see the enclosed. You might consider circulating this to the other Integrating Committee members.

WE ARE SENDING 3 PAGES (including this cover page). If you do not receive all pages satisfactorily, please call (513) 381-2838, ext. 173.

---

To send to any of our automatic machines, please dial direct:

(513) 381-0205

For assistance or confirmation, please call (513) 381-2838, ext. 173.

---

This message may constitute privileged attorney-client communication or attorney work product, and unauthorized use or disclosure is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient of this message, please advise us by calling collect at (513) 381-2838 and forward the document to us by mail at the address above.

---

Send to: Automatic telecopier number 723-9748

Confirmation number ( do not call) \_\_\_\_\_

# Green township

administration offices

6303 harrison avenue • cincinnati, ohio 45247-6498 • (513) 574-4848/fax 574-6260

## VIA FACSIMILE

April 18, 1996

Mr. Joe Cottrell  
Hamilton County Engineer's Office  
Room 700, County Administration Building  
800 Broadway  
Cincinnati, OH 45202

Dear Joe:

Dave Savage, Dan Brooks, Joe Sykes and I recommend the following changes to the rating system:

1. Change points on factor 10 (\$5.00 license fee, infrastructure levy) from 2-1-0 to 5-3-0.
2. Change points on "economic health" from 10-8-6-4-2 to 5-4-3-2-1.
3. Add a need-based criteria that rewards jurisdictions who have either followed prudent infrastructure maintenance programs or whose projects have reached the end of their standard useful lives, by creating a new 5-3-0 point category. To use roads as an example, assuming a road has a thirty-year useful life if properly constructed and maintained, a road that has not received substantial attention via rehab or reconstruction would receive the following points depending on the number of years elapsed since initial construction or subsequent rehab or reconstruction:

<u>Years</u>	<u>Points</u>
25 or more	5 points
20-24	3 points
under 20	0 points

Stated somewhat differently, a project with 0-16.6% of its useful life remaining would receive 5 points, a project with 16.7 - 33.3% of its useful life remaining would receive 3 points, and all others 0 points. The theory is that a jurisdiction who is coming in for SCIP money on a project that has not reached its standard useful life ought to either wait or should have done a better job of maintaining it. The theory is, further, that with so

many of the rating system factors tilting the process in favor of big projects which enhance serviceability or involve a large number of users or create better commercial/industrial access, some factor should be added that benefits projects that need attention simply by reason of the fact that they have received no substantial attention in decades. Thus, this factor is a "leveler."

Items for Support Staff to consider include the following:

- a) definition of standard useful life by type of infrastructure;
- b) definition of what it means to have a piece of infrastructure go "without substantial attention" for a long time (for example, our view is that, in the case of roads, pothole patching, isolated partial or full depth repairs, etc., would not qualify as "substantial attention");
- c) develop criteria for how we measure (or what proof we need to measure) whether a road has gone without attention for an appreciable length of time -- will we take the applicant's affidavit as good enough subject to a visual confirmation by staff, or do we need something more? in the case of a road that has never received attention since initial construction, what proof do we need as to year of initial construction?

Finally, per our discussion this morning, the very end of the rating system should contain a statement something like this:

Ultimate review of Support Staff's interpretation and application of these project selection criteria rests with the Integrating Committee, which has the authority in all cases to interpret these criteria flexibly and to ensure that exceptional cases may be considered in a manner accomplishing substantial justice.

Sincerely,



William J. Seitz

WJS/kon

mailed 5-2-96  
gc

## **DISTRICT NO. 2**

### **SUPPORT STAFF**

The Support Staff offers the following response to the letter submitted by William Seitz, David Savage, Daniel Brooks and Joe Sykes, dated April 18, 1996:

It appears that the intent of the proposed changes is to reward jurisdictions that have had a history of providing needed maintenance on their infrastructure. While at first glance this may appear to be a reasonable thing to do, it does not necessarily agree with the thinking in the original legislation. The intent has been to provide a method for replacing or repairing the infrastructure that was in disrepair. A jurisdiction that has provided funds via fees or levies and has funded an aggressive maintenance program that has extended the life of its infrastructure should not get more points when its facilities are better than that of a jurisdiction which has not had the wherewithal to do a good job of maintenance.

The first three items listed in the letter deal with changing the point structure on Rating Factors 5, "Economic Health", and 10, "License plate fees/Levies/Taxes", as well as adding an additional rating factor for infrastructure maintenance. The current rating system is comprised of 77 points. Of those points, 60 are from mandated factors listed in Chapter 164 of the ORC, and 17 are in the "others" category which are left to the discretion of the local integrating committee. This gives a 77%-23% split, meeting the requirements of the administrative code which requires that a minimum of 75% of the points come from the mandated factors. Changing the point structure to what has been proposed will have 55 of 80 points from mandated factors, or 69%, and 25 points from "others", or 31%. This will be deemed unacceptable by OPWC.

Adding the item for "Infrastructure Maintenance/Useful Life" will create added problems in the rating system by creating an item that is very subjective. There are many factors that can affect the condition of a road regardless of the amount of maintenance that has been performed, such as: a change in the usage of the facility (large growth area), utility cuts/relocations, safety upgrades or poor construction/inspection of the original facility. Jurisdictions may choose to divert maintenance monies from a facility knowing that it is scheduled for a major rehabilitation in the near future. This diversion of funding would hurt its rating for the project, despite the fact that the jurisdiction is practicing sound fiscal policy otherwise (i.e., not pouring money into a road that is going to be replaced). In the first three rounds of funding, District 2's Rating Criteria had such an item, where the jurisdiction submitted information listing percent of infrastructure (of each type) that was in poor, fair or good condition. This was dropped because of many inaccuracies and false information given on the application. Further, since OPWC already observes maintenance effort through their review of each jurisdiction's Capital Improvement Report, we feel that any appropriate action regarding this matter should be left to them. Judging a jurisdiction's maintenance program on one project would not be accurate. In this scenario, a particular jurisdiction could receive ten points on one project and zero on another. What does this say about their maintenance program?

The letter from the four Committee Members suggested that consideration be given to the age or useful life of a facility, which may be difficult to establish. There are many factors that determine the useful life of a facility and these factors can change during the life of a facility. However, for roadways, a quote from the "Thickness Design Asphalt Pavements for Highways and Streets", published by the Asphalt Institute states the following: *"Design Period - A pavement may be designed to support the cumulative effects of traffic for any period of time. The selected period, in years, for which the pavement is to be designed is called the Design Period. At the end of the Design Period it can be expected that the pavement may require some rehabilitation, usually including an asphalt overlay, to restore high-level riding quality. The Design Period, however, should not be confused either with pavement life or with the Analysis Period. Pavement life may be extended indefinitely, through overlays or other rehabilitation measures, until the roadway becomes obsolete through changes in grade, alignment, or other factors."*

Next, a definition for infrastructure going "without substantial attention for a long time" was requested. The Support Staff believes this is an area too subjective to properly define because of the number of variables involved, such as, environmental factors, inability to obtain past maintenance records, differing opinions on what constitutes "substantial", etc.

Finally, a request to develop criteria for measuring whether or not a road has gone without attention for an appreciable length of time was considered. It must be stressed that there are several other types of infrastructure (not just roads) that are eligible for funding, including bridges, waste water treatment systems, water supply systems, solid waste disposal facilities, flood control systems, storm and sanitary collection, storage and treatment facilities and equipment related to those systems (ORC 164.01). These facilities require very little maintenance for a long number of years. The Support Staff does not believe that records/documents submitted with applications are always truthful, as has been the past history of many applicants. However, while records, documentation, etc. may be obtained, it will NOT be an accurate state of condition and may not be relevant. Information available may vary widely from one jurisdiction to another, and may not reflect current usage of the infrastructure involved. We do not see any valid way to develop such criteria.

The Support Staff does agree that there should be some change to the rating system to reward those jurisdictions that are doing something to help maintain their infrastructure. The current Rating Factor No. 10 can be used to do this. The idea of changing this item to a 5-3-0 point item is a good one. By simply changing that, and no others, the rating system would have 80 points, and the split between mandated factors and other factors would be 75%-25%, which is acceptable to OPWC. This would be an incentive to those who do not qualify for points in this category to do something to get more funds for maintenance of their infrastructure, as well as reward those who currently do so.

04/18/96

## DISTRICT 2 INTEGRATING COMMITTEE LISTING OF MEMBERS

NO.	OFFICE	NAME OF MEMBER	BEGINNING TERM DATE	EXPIRATION DATE	APPOINTMENT DATE	APPOINTING AUTHORITY
1	CHAIR	WILLIAM W. BRAYSHAW	01-Jun-88	31-May-97	01-Jun-94	BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
2		RICHARD D. HUDDLESTON	01-Jun-88	31-May-97	12-Apr-95	BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
3		JOHN H. HAMNER	01-Jun-88	31-May-97	01-Jun-94	CEO OF LARGEST MUNICIPALITY
4		W. PETER HEILE	01-Jun-88	31-May-97	01-Jun-94	CEO OF LARGEST MUNICIPALITY
5		RICHARD MENDES	01-Jun-88	31-May-97	01-Jun-94	CEO OF LARGEST MUNICIPALITY
6		DAVID SAVAGE	01-Jun-88	31-May-97	21-Apr-95	MAJORITY OF CEO'S OF OTHER MUNICIPALITIES
7		DANIEL BROOKS	01-Jun-88	31-May-97	21-Apr-95	MAJORITY OF CEO'S OF OTHER MUNICIPALITIES
8		JOSEPH I. SYKES	01-Jun-88	31-May-97	01-Jun-94	MAJORITY OF BOARDS OF TWP. TRUSTEES
9		WILLIAM J. SEITZ	01-Jun-88	31-May-97	01-Jun-94	MAJORITY OF BOARDS OF TWP. TRUSTEES

**60th District 2 Integrating Committee Meeting  
County Commissioner's Conference Room  
County Administration Building  
Room 603  
Cincinnati, Ohio 45202  
April 18, 1996 - 8:00 a.m.**

**AGENDA**

- 1.) Approval of previous meeting's minutes
- 2.) Report by District Liaison on status of Integrating Committee members appointments.
- 3.) Request from Colerain Township for Project Agreement Amendments for two LTIP (Round 9) projects. (Vote required)
- 4.) Support Staff items:
  - (A) Report by District Liaison of status of Round 10.
  - (B) Presentation of Round 11 Rating System. (Vote required for adoption. NOTE: Rating System must be approved and received by OPWC no later than June 28, 1996)
- 5.) Small Governments Subcommittee report.

The Small Government Commission Director, David Kern, has reported that the Round 10 awards will be made at the May meeting of the Small Government Commission.
- 6.) Old business.
- 7.) New business.

Round 10 Project Agreements will be presented at a Press Conference on Friday, June 28, 1996 at 10:30 a.m. by Mr. Larry Bicking, Director of OPWC. The Press Conference will be held in the Commissioners large assembly room. Please plan on attending.
- 8.) Next meeting date is Friday, May 17, 1996, if needed.
- 9.) Adjournment

60th District #2 Integrating Committee Meeting  
Board of County Commissioners' Conference Room  
Room 603, County Administration Building  
Cincinnati, OH 45202

April 18, 1996 - 8:00 a.m.

ATTENDANCE LIST

<u>NAME</u>	<u>AFFILIATION</u>	<u>PHONE NO.</u>
Bill Seitz	Green Twp	357-9332
Joe Sykes	Miami Twp.	941 3393
DAVID J. STURGE	HCML	821-7266
Richard Mendes	City of Cin	352-2457
W. Peter Heile	City of Cin	352-3337
Richard D. Huelbertson	Bel City Linn	771-0900
<del>David D. Bond</del>	HCML	521-7413
William Branshaw	Ham Co. Engr.	632-8630